That Was No Lincoln-Douglas Debate, P. 4

For the Voice of the New Africa on World Problems See the Nkrumah Boxes, Pages 2-3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 35 OCTOBER 3, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

How the Neutrals See the Struggle at the UN

United Nations, Sept. 27

The U.S. press is behaving almost as badly as the Soviet press in providing its readers with a distorted view of what is going on at this session of the United Nations. The reporters act more and more like a claque and mob, cheering our side and hooting theirs in a way which may comfort the President and Secretary of State but gives foreign visitors a poor opinion of our free press. Like the Russian reporters, ours—with some honorable exceptions—get their cue from official briefings and run in so overwhelming a pack the lone dissenter is made to feel unpatriotic. But our national interests are poorly served by misinformation, particularly when we confront a new United Nations dominated by neutrals. It is more important than ever to understand the neutral point of view. I want to try and sketch its main outlines here.

Main Enemy the Belgians

1. The main enemy as the neutrals see it in the Congo crisis is not the danger of Russian penetration but the continued success of the Belgians in detaching and controlling the two rich portions of the Congo: uranium-rich Katanga and diamond-producing Kasai. As the neutrals see it, a legally constituted government, that of Kasavubu and Lumumba, the product of orderly elections under the Congo constitution, appealed to the UN for aid against Belgian aggression only to find that the UN was treating its Belgian-inspired secessionist elements on an equal plane with its central government, and thus encouraging not only secession but upsetting the fragile stability of the new government at its center. When Nasser told the General Assembly today that "the Congo presents us with a masked imperialism, which does not shrink from exploiting the United Nations organization itself, in order to realize its hidden designs and aims," his words should not be dismissed as Soviet propaganda; this is how Africa feels.

2. There is hardly a new State in Africa which is really a nation, which is not beset by tribal and regional rivalries and where foreign interests may not conspire as in the Congo to detach the richest portions. This is what Kkrumah of Ghana meant when he told the General Assembly Sept. 23 "What is happening in the Congo today may happen in any other part of Africa tomorrow, and what the United Nations does today must set a precedent or a pattern for what it may have to do tomorrow." There is not a single African or Asian State which will contradict Nkrumah's assertion that once the UN goes to the assistance of a country which invites intervention "it owes an obligation to the Government and people of that country not to interfere in such a way as to prevent the legitimate Government which invited it to enter the country from fulfilling its mandate. In other words, it is impossible for the United Nations at one and the same time to preserve law and order and be neutral between the legal authorities and the law breakers."

Not to Be Lost Sight Of

"As for the Congo's own revenues, he [Stere Lanner, head of UN civilian aid] said the splitting away of Katanga had cut the Congo's income 60 percent."

—"UN Congo Aide Fears 'Disaster' New York Times, Sept. 28, dispatch from Leopoldville.

"Tshombe said in the Katanga capital, Elisabethville, that he is willing to collaborate with other regions of the Congo but that he will fight on for Katanga's independence. He said Katanga was willing to enter a confederation but only as 'a sovereign state'."

—"Mobutu Bids Rival Chiefs to 'Summit'" Washington Post, from Leopoldville, Sept. 28.

"Just how independent Mr. Tshombe wishes Katanga to be is still a mystery to UN officials here. His reliance on Belgian officials, technicians and officers is still considerable. Mr. Berendson, Political Director of the UN here called Friday on President Tshombe to offer him UN technical aid. Mr. Tshombe thanked him but replied that Katanga was satisfied with the technical help it was already receiving from Belgium."

—London Daily Telegraph, Sept. 26, dispatch from Elisabethville, capital of Katanga.

"Brussels, Sept. 27—Premier Gaston Eyskens said today Belgium is ready to grant any requested help to the Congo but is 'determined to safeguard her moral and material interests' there."

—Reuters.

3. While the U.S. press is praising Hammarskjold for keeping the Russians out of the Congo, the Africans criticize him for failing to get the Belgians out. Unlike the Russians, the Africans are not prepared to throw Hammarskjold overboard. The Russians are smarting from the Secretary General's action in shutting off the airports to their planes and from the Mobutu affair in which their diplomatic representatives and technicians were forced out of Leopoldville; they suspect Western intrigue with UN complaisance behind this "strong man" episode. But the Africans still see the UN as the one source through which they can get the technical aid they need so badly without direct great Power strings on it, and the only means by which they can defeat neo-colonialist intrigue without being caught in an East-West struggle. So Nkrumah coupled his criticism with gentler words about these being "the growing pains of the UN" and about it being "entirely wrong to blame either the Security Council or any senior officials of the UN for what has taken place." But the Africans are willing to support the Secretary General only if he

(Continued on Page Two)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from Page One)

supports them. Their price is the restoration of the Kasavubu-Lumumba government, the disarming of "the Belgian officered forces in the Katanga" (Nkrumah) and a firm hand through Hammarskjold's African consultative committee on the way financial and technical aid is given the Congo.

Moscow Gives Africa Leverage

Until they are sure that the Secretary General is moving definitely in this direction, there will be no rally against the Russian proposal for a trumvirate to replace the Secretary Generalship. Russian intransigeance gives them leverage; without the Russian threat they would have little bargaining power. Hence the significant silence of the African States on the Russian proposals and the pointed action of the Egyptians today in issuing a press release which asserted that Nasser's talk with Eisenhower the day before "had nothing to do with the Secretariat." This deflated that 4-column headline at the top of the *New York Times* this morning, "Nehru and Nasser Tell President They Oppose Khrushchov's Plan" and that story under it which began (in the personality cult manner of *Pravda*), "President Eisenhower scored a major personal and diplomatic triumph yesterday. . . ." In my opinion Nehru is too experienced an operator to have shown his hand so early when he was still engaged in trying to bring East and West together. The headlines and the story were another triumph of Hagertyism over reality. It is dangerous for the President and the American people to go on indulging in the blissful visions induced by this kind of opium.

4. The Russians are being shrewder than we are in dealing with the neutrals. The neutral leaders know all about Hungary. The new African leaders did not emerge from the bush; they are cultivated men; even the two Congolese who have addressed the UN, Kanza and Gizenga, spoke with a grace and a dignity and a magnanimity toward the Belgians which won respect. These men know the Russians hold their satellites with an iron hand. But the Russians can point to Egypt as an example of a country which has accepted extensive Soviet aid without losing its independence. However quick the Russians were to belabor dissident Hungarian Communists as Horthyite landowners, they speak no such language when they go a-wooing in Africa and Latin America. We, on the other hand, are quick to slander and question the motives of those who will not do our bidding. Secretary Herter's Red smear remark about Nkrumah horrified the skillful British. Nkrumah is a new major personality on the UN scene, a man with ideas and considerable courage, as evidenced by his support of Israel and his plea to the Arabs to recognize "political realities." (See boxes on pages two and three.) Mr. Eisenhower's address the day before, though one of his better efforts, seemed pale and platitudinous beside the fresh ideas and eloquent language of Nkrumah next morning. I was hoping that the President would step off the rostrum and walk over and shake hands with Fidel Castro and make a pleasant American-style joke and deflate the overblown quarrel between us and Cuba; a big man, with the imagination to be unconventional, would have done it and the gesture would have been worth millions

The Intervention Nkrumah Wants

"I, personally, and my government have done everything possible to assist and advise the leaders of the Congo to resolve their differences and place their country's and Africa's interests first. Both of them, President Kasavubu and Prime Minister Lumumba, speak the same language of peace and unity. Both of them are anxious to see stability achieved in their country. Both of them agree to reconciliation. What then, prevents them from coming together? What has led to the fake Mobutu episode? I can assure the General Assembly that but for the intrigues of the colonialists a document of reconciliation which has been drafted in the presence of my Ambassador in Leopoldville and approved by both Mr. Kasavubu and Mr. Lumumba would have been signed by them.

"Imperialist intrigue, stark and naked, was desperately at work to prevent this being signed. The policy of divide and rule is still being practiced. It is quite clear that a desperate attempt is being made to create confusion in the Congo, extend the cold war to Africa, and involve Africa in the suicidal quarrels of foreign Powers. The United Nations must not allow this to happen. We, for our part, will not allow it to happen. That is why we are anxious that the UN, having reached a point where intervention on the side of the legitimate Government of the Congo appears to be the obvious and only answer to this crisis, should act boldly through the medium of the independent African States."

—Nkrumah to the General Assembly, Sept. 23.

Nkrumah's Version of How The Trouble in the Congo Was Precipitated

"No African could hope to rise to the lowest commissioned rank in the army. The whole force of the Force Publique [the Congo army organized by the Belgians] was subject to extremely harsh discipline and had very low rates of pay. . . . As soon as an African became Minister of Defense, the incongruous position of the African in the Force Publique became evident.

"Great discontent resulted. Even so, the situation might not have erupted had the Belgian commander of the Force Publique adopted a realistic attitude towards the men, and made any attempt to redress their legitimate grievances.

"Even a promise of future reform might have done some good. On the contrary, emphatic statements were indiscreetly made by Belgian officers that nothing had changed and that life would go on in much the same way as before independence; in short, the soldiers were told that independence was a sham and that Belgium still wielded a big stick. This produced the mutiny.

"When the mutiny occurred, large numbers of Belgians began to leave the country. The President of the Republic, Mr. Kasavubu, and the Prime Minister, Mr. Lumumba, went to Matadi in order to appeal to the Belgians to remain. But instead, they were all taken on board a ship on the advice of the Belgian Consul, while the town was machine-gunned from the air by Belgian military aircraft and shelled from the sea. Despite the fact that there were no Belgian civilians whatever to protect [i.e. in Matadi, the Congo seaport], Belgian troops entered the town and shot in cold blood a number of unarmed police and civilians. It was following upon this incident that acts of organized violence by the Force Publique began to occur. These incidents, in turn, provided an occasion for Belgian military intervention.

"Meanwhile, ostensibly on the grounds of safeguarding the lives of Belgians in the Province, Belgian troops entered Katanga in considerable numbers and enabled the Chairman of the Provincial Council, Moise Tshombe, to set himself up as the head of a so-called independent state."

—President Nkrumah of Ghana addressing the 15th Session of the UN General Assembly, Sept. 23.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Latin America. As it is, we hurt ourselves by smearing in Nkrumah the new Africa's leading spokesman and by ostentatiously seeking to ostracize in Castro the hero of the Latin American masses. This pantomime, compared with Khrushchov's bear hug for Fidel, is the poorest kind of public relations, however much it may be applauded in the rather loutish atmosphere our right wing papers have created in New York City toward the United Nations.

Giddy With Rocket Success

5. The neutrals were dismayed by the tone of Khrushchov's speech to the Assembly. Its tone made political sense only if he was trying to warn the Western powers that he could cause plenty of trouble for them in Africa if they did not sit down and deal with him or if it was intended to show Peking that Khrushchov could make like a revolutionary leader, too. Indeed the Russians to cover their flank against critics of his speech spread the story that he had to talk that way in order to appease Peking; I'm inclined to think this a publicity smokescreen; Moscow doesn't have to dance to Peking's tune. I am inclined to put the tone down to Khrushchov's *nouveau riche* peasant exuberance; his rockets have made him, in Stalin's words, a little giddy with success. If the Russians want to end the cold war, they ought not to make cold war speeches. If they want co-existence, they cannot at the same time talk like neo-Jacobins leading an African mob to revolutionary war against the West. A few words of praise for the English and French in those areas where they *have* prepared native elites to take over would have been tactful and made his criticism of the Belgians all the more potent. The fury of the British spokesman after the Khrushchov speech was genuine if unexpectedly violent; Russia's own "colonial" record in East Europe shows considerably less concern for the feeling of the native masses than do the British even in Rhodesia and Kenya. In any case the Congo's experience shows that what the remaining colonial areas of Africa need is not so much immediate independence as immediate steps under international auspices to prepare their peoples for peaceful transition to self-government. Otherwise they must fall victims to new forms of control either from West or East.

Nkrumah on Nuclear Questions

Nkrumah, in the General Assembly, Sept. 23 proposed that the UN "encourage the growth of zones free from nuclear warfare"; asked the nuclear powers "to keep Africa out of their nuclear warfare plans"; suggested that the problem of overcoming mutual suspicion in policing nuclear agreements might be solved by using inspection teams from "the small uncommitted nations"; protested French nuclear tests in the Sahara; urged the other nuclear powers to let the French use "their own testing grounds" instead; and called on the African States to isolate Africa from nuclear war by acting to prevent any nuclear State "from possessing military bases" on their continent.

6. But the neutrals would be more ready to take note of Soviet shortcomings if our press were not so overwhelmingly raucuous in its exaggerations. From the neutral point of view, we are still using our power against the true wishes even of Britain and France to keep China out of the UN and to maintain the Formosan farce. From their point of view, we are just as stubborn as the Russians if not more so about breaking the ice for a new try at summit talks. Most important of all in neutral eyes is the issue of disarmament. They see the arms race wasting the substance they need to free themselves from poverty and creating tensions which must lead to a war from which they could not protect themselves. One neutral speaker after another stressed disarmament as a No. 1 concern. Yet here the Russians have very concrete proposals while we are still offering little but talk of control. The new Khrushchov proposals moved a little further in the direction of meeting Western objections, particularly in offering a sharper cut of conventional forces in the first stage. If our government thinks their offer utopian, it is up to us to offer something of our own and really to negotiate. The Soviet proposal today to add five neutrals (India, Indonesia, Mexico, Ghana and the UAR) to the ten nation disarmament commission seems eminently sensible to the neutrals. Our first swift reaction of rejection would wisely be reconsidered.

Nkrumah on Other World Problems in His Speech to the UN General Assembly

ON AFRICA: Nkrumah proposed that the Union of South Africa be asked to surrender its mandate over South West Africa to a committee of all the independent African States under the UN; accused the Union of South Africa of establishing "a policy of racial discrimination and persecution which in its essential inhumanity surpasses even the brutality of the Nazis against the Jews"; declared that in Portugese Africa "there exists forced labor which is akin to slavery" and called on Portugal's fellow NATO members to force her to grant independence to her African colonies in keeping with the NATO preamble's words about upholding "democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law;" called for an end of the war in Algeria by negotiations with "The Algerian Nationalist Government" on the basis of those principles of self-determination which de Gaulle himself proclaimed a year ago; pointed out that of 230 million people in Africa only 3 percent were of non-African origin and said "no reasonable solution can be found to the African problem . . . if political thinking in regard to a solution begins with the rights of the 3 percent;" asked the UN to call on all member States to grant independence to their remaining African colonies and proposed a permanent African seat on the Security Council when the Charter is revised.

ON THE MIDDLE EAST: Called for settlement of the Israel dispute by "recognition of the political realities", by guaranteeing Israel and the Arab States from attack by each other and by an arrangement to "keep the cold war out of the Middle East; proposed steps be taken to exploit the region's oil wealth "on a non-competitive basis."

ON THE FAR EAST: Called for admission of Communist China to the UN, and urged general elections to end the continued division of Vietnam and Korea, recalling Nehru's plea against moving UN forces north of the 38th parallel after the North Koreans had been driven back.

ON DISARMAMENT: Proposed that the UN establish technical teams to study "what could be done with the resources which are at present being wasted in armaments"; said an explosion could be averted if population grew in the underdeveloped countries while the resources they needed continued to be wasted on the arms race; and noted that in some countries" industrial prosperity is associated with armament "and a recession with a slowing down of military effort" because "disarmament is looked at in a vacuum" and not "as a means for the redeployment of the capital resources and the technical skills now being used for military purposes."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Great Debate Provokes Great Yawn: Nixon More Liberal Than Kennedy on Red Menace

We Predict Nixon-Kennedy Show Will Have Trouble Getting A Sponsor

For the first time, incredibly, after years of exasperated TV viewing, I found myself wishing for a commercial as that long hour of sedate debate between Nixon and Kennedy dragged on. Both candidates seemed grown up brighter-than-average high school debaters, well stocked with statistics, and fully capable, like all good debaters, of switching sides with undiminished earnestness. But neither emanated that flame of conviction, whether for good or evil, which creates leadership. Kennedy seemed a trifle more agile, perhaps because Nixon had the stodgier side to defend. Viewed close up, neither side of Kennedy's very asymmetrical face seemed particularly attractive. As for Nixon there were moments, when he tried to smile, which were downright frightening; he looked like an undertaker congratulating a steady customer on another death in the family.

Kennedy Begins to Sound Like John Foster Dulles

Howard K. Smith as moderator was funereal; the four reporters were as dull as the two candidates. I felt as if I had been smoking more and enjoying it less, and that neither Nixon nor Kennedy tasted as good as a good cigarette should. Kennedy's opener, which sought to associate himself with Abraham Lincoln, about the world too not being able to go on half free and half slave was worn to shreds by the late John Foster Dulles whom Kennedy is beginning more and more to resemble. He also borrowed FDR's line about a rendez-vous with destiny, apparently on the same advertising technique of creating glamor by association. We predict that these debates will have a hard time getting a sponsor.

In the only exchange that touched on civil liberties, Nixon emerged more liberal than Kennedy. Asked about the Communist menace, Kennedy thought we should "support the laws which the U.S. has passed in order to protect us from those who would destroy us from within" and sustain the FBI. By comparison, Nixon sounded like an ACLU-er; he thought that while we should be alert, we ought also to be fair "because by being fair [we do hope Helen Gahagan Douglas was listening] we uphold the very freedoms that the Communists would destroy." He stressed the "few" who become Communists and fellow travellers and said we fight communism by fighting the injustices "the Communists feed upon." This is a good point at which to recall that Nixon and Kennedy both voted in 1950 to override Truman's veto of the Internal Security Act. On the civil liberties question Nixon was the new Nixon but Kennedy the old Kennedy.*

A Telegram to Kennedy

"We applaud your call for new efforts to aid underdeveloped countries, especially through the UN. However, we question your assumption that the Communists will not 'talk about disarmament' until we have an invulnerable superior nuclear capacity. Since 1955 the Russians have been trying to promote disarmament negotiations; the problem has been to get them to accept adequate inspection. They have signed both Austrian and Antarctic treaties. Nuclear test ban agreement could be reached within months if both sides were sufficiently determined. There is no need to wait for an illusory military capability before reaching first step disarmament agreement to bring mounting dangers of the arm race under control. We urge you if elected to achieve during your first 90 days conclusion of a test ban treaty and establishment of national peace agency."

—National Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy
—Friends Committee on National Legislation by E. Raymond Wilson.

This telegram was sent Senator Kennedy Sept. 22 after the speech in which he said that during his first 90 days in office our next President should ask Congress for funds "to give us a nuclear retaliatory power second to none, make it invulnerable to surprise attack" and conventional forces for "brush fire" wars, adding "only then can we get Mr. Khrushchov and the Chinese Communists to talk seriously about disarmament."

*** Victor Lasky in a letter published by the Washington Post Sept. 22 quoted from an article in the New Republic of Oct. 13, 1952 by Dr. John P. Mallan, then of Harvard University. Dr. Mallan reported that Kennedy told an informal gathering at Harvard Nov. 10, 1950 "that he rather respected Joe McCarthy", and "he personally was very happy" over Helen Gahagan Douglas's defeat by Nixon.**

Why Not A Gift Sub to That Boy or Girl Off to College—Give Them A Fresh View of the World Each Week

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/3/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED